

Faculty Welfare Committee Meeting - APPROVED

November 13, 2013

In attendance: Bethany Bell, Allison Anders, Tommy Hodges, Christine Lotter, Jeremy Searson, Diane Monrad, Joe Flora, Eva Monsma, Lem Watson, Mike Seaman, Zach Kelehear, Erik Drasgow, David Virtue, Lynda Nilges-Charles, and Phil Young

Minutes submitted by: Bethany A. Bell

- This FWC meeting included several guests that were invited to share each department's current APR process – this meeting was approved by FWC members after it was suggested to the committee based on feedback obtained at Steering Committee, in response to the committee's concern with equity of processes across departments (see minutes from September 11, 2013 FWC meeting).

Summary of key statements/thoughts/concerns organized by department is presented below.

EDST:

Criteria are written by faculty --- department chair has little input – up to the committee

New T&P criteria were just approved so the department will be revamping APR – developing rubrics to make it clearer. Plan to include the opportunity for faculty to get feedback in person from the APR committee. Goal of the revising process and forms is to make the criteria much more observable and easier to get consistency.

Talking about having the top EDST teachers do the Peer Reviews so they are better than just “friends” doing it. How do we move the standard higher?

In EDST, generally, APR rewards quantity over quality.

No assistance professors involved in evaluation process.

In terms of the weight of each of the typical 3 pillars of APR, EDST faculty determined a 40/40/20 distribution of teaching, research, and service for tenure track. Clinical faculty have a weight of 100% for the primary role of that position (i.e., if a person's position is 100% focused on teaching than APR ratings are based on teaching).

Faculty do not truly rate themselves based on the criteria as part of the APR process, but, faculty can use their personal statement to express the ratings and how they have met unit criteria.

When asked why EDST kept the APR process closed to only tenured faculty, responses was “History; The idea of senior faculty providing guidance and feedback in ways that they can be successful in the field. Junior faculty will not be able to provide substantive and developmental feedback. However, I do think there is an older culture that emphasizes peer-reviewed journal

articles that are first author, and a younger culture that focuses on grants and collaborative work.”

Summary thoughts:

The P&T criteria should be guiding faculty

The values in our department are numbers

Right now committees tend to give more points for grants

How do we operationalize R1 productivity?

Mission of the university, the provost’s office is clear: “doctoral training” yet most documents don’t have much emphasis on that at all.

EDLP:

Some what problematic – according to the by-laws there is one committee that evaluates clinical and tenure although duties are very different.

Very informal – brought together in January – reviewed by people via forms that were anonymous. Far too informal.

Questions: Chair eval be summative for the record? And committee feedback be formative??
Need consistency in the role that department chairs play in this process.

PEAT:

Uses a point system.

Spilt into groups – make sure that all areas are represented, different ranks are represented, including clinical – they review each other. In the process of revising APR documents – want to improve weaknesses. Their APR by-laws require the department to review their APR documents and processes every 3 years.

Some of the current areas that they are discussing include: (a) trouble discerning rank/impact of new journals, the issues that some practical journals will reach broader audiences vs. high impact journals may not; (b) data based vs. theoretical work; (c) where does editorial board work belong – service or scholarship; (d)

Sub-committee reviews, chair tallies the reviews and then submits to the department chair and the department chair does his/her own review. One-on-one meeting with the department chair for untenured faculty. APR committee delivers two review forms --- one is the summary sheet of “points”—points vary by quality of the journal, type of presentations, etc. they also have points for types of articles.

Have a special category for clinical faculty only – professional development/growth that can account for the unique aspects of their positions and expectations. Need to align ratings with responsibilities – if 100% teaching then score is just the teaching rating. Also need to account for administration work and efforts.

Faculty can contest/appeal committee reviews – if not resolved with the committee that did the initial review, the appeal goes to the second committee. Final decision lies with the department chair. Have a transparent process for the most part which has caused very little need for re-review. Chairs review is very often consistent with committee reviews.

PEAT faculty also conduct a self-evaluation as part of the APR process. Faculty complete the department's APR scoring sheet (i.e., they apply the criteria to themselves and submit as part of their overall APR document submission). Overall, these self-evaluations tend to be close to committee evaluations. APR – everyone can review everyone else. No hierarchy.

Should clinical and tenure be pulled together when it comes to raises?

ITE:

Unclear the role that department chair has in the APR process – ITE documents do not seem to require a chair review but Lem wants Chair's to provide feedback to faculty. Trying to clarify what department chair responsibility is.

Tommy's question about the importance of presentations and organizing conferences vs. publications seems more “national” than a publication that might get read by 5 people.

LEM: Chair's must provide feedback – specific and individual, regardless of what current department “criteria” say. Faculty must be provided annual letters, especially those working towards tenure still. Independent feedback is responsibility of the chair – clear feedback is required. Annual letters will contain each faculty member's ratings for the year, the department's average ratings for the year, and the ratings of faculty serving on the department's APR committee. The obligation for any administrator in this college is to give feedback to help tenure-track faculty be successful. Authentic feedback is essential – if a faculty member is rated as “successful” but without any comments, there is something wrong. All APR processes need to be transparent enough that a faculty member can estimate her/his own score – no one should be walking into a black box.

Education is not a “hard science” – issues when looking at other colleges.

What is required as a citizen of the college of education? Minimally – what does this look like? What is minimally expected of you? Why do we continue to go down the road of trying to put

everyone in the same box? We as faculty should look back and see where we can maximize each year.

To expect all faculty in all areas to get major grants is not realistic – but to apply when applicable is worthy.

How do we create a system in which contributions are rewarded? How do differentiate between expected and outstanding. We need to hold committees who make these decisions accountable.

Department chairs should be part of the evaluation process as part of the checks and balances.

Letters that go to the external reviewer's need to come from department chairs and that it clearly says for them to evaluate the candidate using the candidates criteria. There needs to be consistent delivery of these packets so external reviewers can provide fair reviews. Also, the T&P criteria need to be clear and easily understood by external reviewers so they can write clear and informative reviews.

General questions and comments:

What is the role of the APR committee?

Should we have a college process? College is having morale issues due to different procedures across the departments – criteria could vary for each department but the process should be the same across the College.

Need to distinguish between peer/committee evaluation and department chair evaluations – the issue of formative vs. summative (committee = formative and chair = summative)??

Often time committees have a graduate student on them for a different voice. Think having an assistant professor each year as part of department APR committees would be something to consider, something more transparent, especially because P&T is not.

We need to prepare faculty for external reviewers.

So what next:

Department Chairs need to provide feedback annually

Check and balances need to be in place to between APR committee and Department Chair

APR chairs need to work with department chairs and faculty – process needs to be transparent and developmental

Perhaps annual meetings each year on what processes will take place in the annual review process??

Share APR documents (APR chairs should highlight best practices in their units – list of best practices and needs improvement and ways to accomplish them)

Look at the AAUP guidelines when reviewing current APR criteria in each department

APR Letters must summarize your ranking and provide feedback, include the mean for the unit, and the mean of the committee.

Review other departments peer evaluation forms and how they weight those in the “teaching” rating portion of APR?

Zach – looking to see if we can pull out activity classes from the college mean AND if we can separate out graduate and undergraduate courses from the college means.